REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-6 are rejected.

The Specification has been objected to.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. (US

Patent 4,476,541).

The Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Rejection of Claims 1-6, second paragraph

Claim 1 has been amended to more accurately reflect the subject matter of the invention.

The amended claim 1 believed to be bereft of the section 112 issues raised by the Examiner.

Regarding the objection to the term "member," the Examiner is believed to be incorrect

in his position that this term cannot be construed to be a structural feature. This limitations has to

be construed at least under section 112, sixth paragraph. However, the Examiner is completely

incorrect in interpreting this term to be a process step. In making this determination, the

Examiner is referring to pages 7 and 8 and Fig. 2. However, in these passages, the Specification

merely refers to the members as "corresponding to the steps S100…," etc. Clearly, one skilled in

the art will understand that the structural feature (the member) is used to implement the method

step referred to and not the method step itself.

Therefore, the Examiner to withdraw the objections to the use of the term "member."

The applicants respectfully submit that the Federal Circuit has made it clear that so long

as a skilled artisan would know how to implement the functionality using known methods using

a general purpose or a special purpose machine, sufficient structure is disclosed to support the

limitation recited under the "means plus function." *See generally In Re Dossel*, 115 F 3d 942

(Fed. Cir. 1997). In any case, the present invention is not intended to be limited to a specific

algorithm for performing the functionalities required to be performed by the various recited

members.

For example, in claim 2, the member recited on line 3 is required to perform the

functionality of setting a display unit variable which is required to control display positions of

the numeral value every preset dividing digit number. So long as the display processing unit

(item 8 of Fig. 2) can be implemented using known algorithms on general or special purpose

computers by a skilled artisan, the requirement of sufficient structure is disclosed under *In Re*

Dossel.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Rejection of Claim 1 as being anticipated by Watanabe et al.

As a preliminary matter, please note that the Examiner is incorrect in referring to the

primary reference cited by the Examiner as Watanabe et al. The correct patent corresponding to

US 4,476,541 is Boone et al.

In making the above rejection, the Examiner appears to be ignoring all the limitation

related to the wherein clause based on his incorrect position that they are functional limitation

that do not give patentable weight to the structure of the claim. Claim 1 has been revised to more

clearly and positively recite the corresponding limitation as a structural feature of the display

processing unit. We propose notifying the Examiner that the limitation related to the wherein clause cannot be ignored as it is a structural feature.

Notably, Boone does not disclose (or suggest) the present invention including a display processing unit that subdivides the numeral value into a preset digit number such that the display can be understood by an operator and displays a portion of the subdivided numeral values.

Claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable at least for the same reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Chid S. Iyer
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 43,355
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 16, 2009